

**INITIAL STUDY/  
NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

**COACHELLA POCKET 7/MESQUITE ANNEXATION PROJECT  
CITY OF COACHELLA  
RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA**

Prepared for:

City of Coachella  
53990 Enterprise Way  
Coachella, California 92236  
(760) 398-3502

Prepared by:

LSA Associates, Inc.  
3111 E. Tahquitz Canyon Way, Suite 123  
Palm Springs, California 92262  
(760) 416-2075

LSA Project No. 20241763.01



October 2024

**This page intentionally left blank**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	i
FIGURES AND TABLES .....	ii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS.....	iii
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1-1</b>
1.1 Purpose and Scope.....	1-1
1.2 Regulatory Information.....	1-1
1.3 Document Contents .....	1-2
1.4 Contact Person .....	1-2
<b>2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....</b>	<b>2-1</b>
2.1 Project Site Setting.....	2-1
2.2 Project Background.....	2-1
2.3 Proposed Project.....	2-7
2.4 Project Approvals .....	2-7
2.5 Documents Incorporated by Reference.....	2-7
<b>3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST .....</b>	<b>3-1</b>
3.1 Environmental Checklist Form .....	3-1
3.2 Environmental Factors Potentially Affected .....	3-3
3.3 Determination (To Be Completed By the Lead Agency) .....	3-3
3.4 Evaluation of Environmental Impacts .....	3-4
3.5 Environmental Analysis.....	3-5
3.5.1 Aesthetics .....	3-6
3.5.2 Agricultural Resources.....	3-8
3.5.3 Air Quality.....	3-10
3.5.4 Biological Resources .....	3-13
3.5.5 Cultural Resources.....	3-16
3.5.6 Energy.....	3-18
3.5.7 Geology and Soils.....	3-19
3.5.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	3-23
3.5.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....	3-24
3.5.10 Hydrology and Water Quality.....	3-27
3.5.11 Land Use and Planning .....	3-31
3.5.12 Mineral Resources .....	3-32
3.5.13 Noise.....	3-33
3.5.14 Population and Housing .....	3-35
3.5.15 Public Services .....	3-36
3.5.16 Recreation .....	3-38
3.5.17 Transportation.....	3-39
3.5.18 Tribal Cultural Resources.....	3-41
3.5.19 Utilities and Service Systems .....	3-43
3.5.20 Wildfire .....	3-45
3.5.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance.....	3-47
<b>4.0 REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>4-1</b>

## FIGURES AND TABLES

### FIGURES

Figure 1: Regional Location .....	2-3
Figure 2: General Plan Land Use Designations .....	2-5

### TABLE

Table A: Required Permits and Approvals .....	2-7
---	-----

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

2015 Program EIR	2015 Coachella General Plan Update 2035 Environmental Impact Report
AB	Assembly Bill
AQMP	Air Quality Management Plan
Basin Plan	Colorado River Basin Water Quality Control Plan
CAP	Climate Action Plan
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CGPU	Coachella General Plan Update 2035
City	City of Coachella
CMC	Coachella Municipal Code
CRBRWQCB	Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board
CVMSHCP	Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan
CVUWMP	Coachella Valley Urban Water Management Plan
CVWD	Coachella Valley Water District
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
E-R	Estate Rancho
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FIRM	Flood Insurance Rate Map
Form	Environmental Checklist Form
G-C	General Commercial
GHG	greenhouse gas

---

G-N	General Neighborhood
IS/MND	Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration
LAFCO	Local Agency Formation Commission
MND	Mitigated Negative Declaration
MRZ	Mineral Resource Zone
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
ND	Negative Declaration
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
O <sub>3</sub>	ozone
P7	Planning Area Pocket 7
PM <sub>10</sub>	particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter
PRC	Public Resources Code
project	Coachella Pocket 7/Mesquite Annexation Project
R-R	Rural Rancho
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SCAG	Southern California Association of Governments
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SCH	State Clearinghouse
SOI	Sphere of Influence
USC	United States Code
VMT	vehicle miles traveled

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The purpose of this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) is to (1) describe the proposed Coachella Pocket 7/Mesquite Annexation Project (project), and (2) provide an evaluation of potential environmental effects associated with the project.

This IS/MND has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), as amended (Public Resources Code [PRC] §21000 et seq.) and in accordance with the *State CEQA Guidelines* (California Code of Regulations [CCR] §15000 et seq.). Consistent with *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15071, this IS/MND includes a description of the proposed project, an evaluation of the potential environmental impacts associated with implementation of the proposed project, and findings from the environmental analysis.

Pursuant to Section 15367 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, the City of Coachella (City) is the Lead Agency for the proposed project. The Lead Agency is the public agency that has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. The City, as the Lead Agency, has the authority for project approval and adoption or certification of the accompanying environmental documentation.

### 1.2 REGULATORY INFORMATION

This IS is based on an Environmental Checklist Form (Form), as suggested in Section 15063 (d) and Appendix G of the *State CEQA Guidelines*. An IS informs the decision-making body whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. In accordance with the *State CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15064 (a)(1) states that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must be prepared if there is substantial evidence in light of the whole record that the project under review may have a significant effect on the environment and should be further analyzed to determine mitigation measures or project alternatives that might avoid or reduce project impacts to less than significant levels. A Negative Declaration (ND) may be prepared instead if the Lead Agency finds that there is no substantial evidence in light of the whole record that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. An ND is a written statement describing the reasons why a proposed project, not otherwise exempt from CEQA, would not have a significant effect on the environment and, therefore, why it would not require the preparation of an EIR (*State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15371). According to *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15070, a ND or *mitigated* ND shall be prepared for a project subject to CEQA when either:

1. The IS shows there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the agency, that the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment, or
2. The IS identified potentially significant effects, but:
  - a. Revisions in the project plans or proposals made by or agreed to by the applicant before the proposed MND and IS is released for public review would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effects would occur is prepared, and

- b. There is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the agency, that the proposed project as *revised* may have a significant effect on the environment.

### 1.3 DOCUMENT CONTENTS

This IS/MND contains four chapters. Chapter 1.0, Introduction, provides an overview of the project and the CEQA process. Chapter 2.0, Project Description, provides a detailed description of proposed project components and objectives. Chapter 3.0, Environmental Checklist, provides the Lead Agency's determination based upon this initial evaluation and presents the CEQA checklist and environmental analysis for all impact areas, mandatory findings of significance, and feasible mitigation measures. If the project does not have the potential to significantly impact a given issue area, the relevant section provides a brief discussion of the reasons why no impacts are expected. If the project could have a potentially significant impact on a resource, the issue area discussion provides a description of potential impacts, and appropriate mitigation measures and/or permit requirements that would reduce those impacts to a less than significant level. Chapter 4.0, References, details the documents and reports this document relies upon to provide its analysis.

Chapter 3.0 provides analysis of the potential environmental effects of the proposed project for each of the following areas:

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural and Forestry Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Energy
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Wildfire
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

### 1.4 CONTACT PERSON

The Lead Agency for the IS for the proposed project is the City. Any questions about the preparation of this IS, its assumptions, or its conclusions should be referred to the following:

Gabriel Perez, Development Services Director  
City of Coachella  
53990 Enterprise Way  
Coachella, California 92236  
(760) 398-3502  
gperez@coachella.org

## 2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

### 2.1 PROJECT SITE SETTING


The City of Coachella (City) is a desert community located at the eastern end of the Coachella Valley, in Riverside County, California. Settlement by non-Native Americans began in the mid-1800s, and Coachella slowly grew as it became connected with the rest of Southern California on the Southern Pacific Railroad. The Colorado River provided water for farming and irrigation. The Coachella Valley, including the City of Coachella, the City of Indio, and the unincorporated communities of Thermal and Mecca, is known for producing niche crops such as dates, grapes, lemons, oranges, avocados, figs, persimmons, and mangoes. Lastly, the Coachella Canal was one of the final milestones in the City of Coachella's development, as it contributed to dramatic growth, especially in the southern and eastern portions of the City. Today the City's agricultural wealth offers many jobs for people in the Coachella Valley; additional job types include manufacturing, construction, retail, and professional and management jobs.

### 2.2 PROJECT BACKGROUND

In April 2015, the City Council approved the Coachella General Plan Update 2035 (CGPU) document along with the Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (State Clearinghouse [SCH] No. 2009021007). In 2023, the City prepared an Addendum to the certified 2015 CGPU EIR (2015 Program EIR) to address the potential site-specific environmental impacts associated with the identification of CGPU land use designations for three areas that were evaluated as part of the CGPU Planning Area in the previously certified EIR but for which no CGPU land use designation was identified. One of the three areas analyzed in the Addendum was the area generally bounded by Jackson Street to the west, Avenue 51 to the north (at approximately 0.25 mile), Calhoun Street to the east, and Avenue 52 to the south. This area is known as Planning Area Pocket 7 (P7). Through a General Plan Amendment, General Plan land uses were identified for P7. The seven parcels east of P7 and the 21 parcels north of P7 are included in the City's Sphere of Influence (SOI), as identified in **Figure 2**.

The project site's regional location is identified in **Figure 1**. The approved General Plan land uses for the P7 area are Estate Rancho, Rural Rancho, General Neighborhood, and Suburban Retail District as shown in **Figure 2**. The Estate Rancho General Plan Land Use designation was established for this area for consistency with the Riverside County's Estate Density Residential General Plan designation. An Estate Rancho land use designation allows for a residential density of 1.02.2 dwelling units per acre and allows for single-family dwellings, limited agriculture, and animal keeping under the consistent Residential Estate (R-E) zoning district. A Suburban Retail general plan land use designation was applied to the Forest Lawn Coachella Valley parcel (Assessor's Parcel Number [APN] 779-350-009) with a maximum Floor Area Ratio of 1.0 and allows a range of local and regional serving retail uses with the consistent General Commercial zoning district.

**This page intentionally left blank**



LSA

 Project Site

FIGURE 1




0 1000 2000  
FEET

SOURCE: Esri World Street Map (2023)


I:\2024\20241763\GIS\Pro\Coachella Pocket 7 Annexation Project\Coachella Pocket 7 Annexation Project.aprx (9/27/2024)

Coachella Pocket 7/Mesquite Annexation Project  
Regional Location

**This page is intentionally left blank**



LSA



- Project Site
- Pocket 7 Boundary
- Existing Sphere of Influence
- Mesquite Area
- City Boundaries

- General Plan Land Use Designation
- Estate Rancho
  - General Neighborhood
  - Neighborhood Center
  - Open Space
  - Regional Retail District

- Rural Rancho
- School
- Suburban Retail District
- Suburban Neighborhood
- Urban Neighborhood

FIGURE 2

Coachella Pocket 7/Mesquite Annexation Project  
General Plan Land Use Designations

SOURCE: Esri World Terrain Basemap (2024); City of Coachella (2023)

I:\2024\20241763\GIS\Pro\Coachella Pocket 7 Annexation Project\Coachella Pocket 7 Annexation Project.aprx (9/26/2024)

**This page is intentionally left blank**

### 2.3 PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project, which is currently within the City’s SOI or General Plan Planning Area, would annex 78 parcels and approximately 374 acres generally bounded by Jackson Street to the west, Avenue 50 to the north, Van Buren Street as the closest street to the east, and Avenue 52 to the south (project site), into the City of Coachella. Refer to **Figure 2** for a map identifying the proposed project site. A portion of this area, known as P7, was added to the City’s General Plan Planning Area in 2023 through a General Plan Amendment. The northern and eastern portions of this area were previously included in the City’s SOI and had land use overlays identified in the 2015 Certified General Plan EIR. **Figure 1** shows the regional location and project site for the proposed project. The Riverside Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) is the approving agency for the proposed annexation and SOI update and is a responsible agency with regards to this environmental review pursuant to CEQA.

### 2.4 PROJECT APPROVALS

- This IS/ND is intended to serve as the CEQA document for all actions associated with the proposed project, including all discretionary approvals requested or required of the City to implement the project.
- The project may require approvals, permits, or authorization from other agencies classified as “Responsible Agencies” under CEQA. According to Section 15381 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, a Responsible Agency is defined as a public agency other than the Lead Agency that will have discretionary approval power over the proposed project or some component of the project, including mitigation. Responsible Agencies are identified in **Table A**, Required Permits and Approvals.

**Table A: Required Permits and Approvals**

Permit/Approval	Permitting/Approving Agency	Permit/Approval Trigger
City Planning Commission	City of Coachella Planning Commission	Review and make recommendation to City Council
City Council	City of Coachella City Council	Review the recommendation by the Planning Commission
Riverside Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) Application Packet	Riverside LAFCO	Annexation of land into the City and Sphere of Influence update

Source: Compiled by LSA (2024).

### 2.5 DOCUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

As permitted in Section 15150 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, this IS/MND references several technical studies, analyses, and reports. Information from the documents that have been incorporated by reference has been briefly summarized in the appropriate section(s) of this IS/MND.

Documents incorporated by reference include, but are not limited to, the following:

- City of Coachella; General Plan Update 2035 (CGPU); and
- City of Coachella; General Plan Update 2035 (CGPU) EIR Addendum. July 2023.

- City of Coachella; 2015 CGPU Environmental Impact Report (2015 Program EIR), as amended.
- These documents are available for review at:

City of Coachella  
Development Services Department  
53990 Enterprise Way  
Coachella, California 92236

Hours: Monday–Thursday: 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.  
Friday: Closed

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

#### 3.1 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

---

<b>Project Title:</b>	Coachella Pocket 7/Mesquite Annexation Project
<b>Lead Agency Name and Address:</b>	City of Coachella 53990 Enterprise Way Coachella, California 92236
<b>Contact Person:</b>	Gabriel Perez, Development Services Director
<b>Phone Number:</b>	(760) 398-3502
<b>Email:</b>	gperez@coachella.org
<b>Project Location:</b>	The project site is generally bounded by Jackson Street to the west, Avenue 50 to the north, Van Buren Street as the nearest major street to the east, and Avenue 50 to the south.
<b>Project Sponsor's Name and Address:</b>	City of Coachella 53990 Enterprise Way Coachella, California 92236
<b>General Plan Designations:</b>	According to the City of Coachella's (City) General Plan Land Use Map, the project site is designated Estate Rancho, Rural Rancho, General Neighborhood, and Suburban Retail District.
<b>Zoning:</b>	General Commercial (G-C), General Neighborhood (G-N), Estate Rancho (E-R), and Rural Rancho (R-R)

---

**Description of Project:** The proposed project would annex 78 parcels and approximately 374 acres, which are currently within the City's Sphere of Influence (SOI) or General Plan Planning Area, generally bounded by Jackson Street to the west, Avenue 50 to the north, Van Buren Street to the east, and Avenue 52 to the south. A portion of this area, known as P7, was added to the City's General Plan Planning Area in 2023 through a General Plan Amendment. The northern and eastern portions of this area were previously included in the City's SOI and had land use overlays identified in the 2015 Certified General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The Riverside Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) is the approving agency for the proposed annexation and SOI update and is a responsible agency with regards to this environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

---

**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The City of Coachella is a desert community located at the eastern end of the Coachella Valley, in Riverside County, California. The project area is surrounded by a variety of land uses including a general plan designated regional commercial district to the southeast, though no regional retail district uses currently exist, the Empire Polo Club to the south, and residential to the north and east, including general neighborhood, suburban neighborhood, and urban neighborhood. To the west of the project site, in the City of Indio, the land uses consist of residential uses at the Trilogy at the Polo Club Project Master Plan Area.

---

---

**Other Public Agencies Whose Approval Is Required:**

- City of Coachella Adoption of the IS/MND to allow for the annexation of the project site, currently within the City's SOI or the City's General Plan Planning Area (P7).
- Riverside Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) Application for approval of annexation into City and SOI update.

---

**Consultation with California Native American Tribes:**

- Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21080.3.1, et seq. (codification of Assembly Bill [AB] 52, 2013-14) requires that a Lead Agency, within 14 days of determining that it will undertake a project, must notify in writing any California Native American Tribe traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the project if that Tribe has previously requested notification about projects in that geographic area. The notice must briefly describe the project and inquire whether the Tribe wishes to initiate formal consultation. Tribes have 30 days from receipt of notification to request formal consultation. The Lead Agency then has 30 days to initiate the consultation, which then continues until the parties come to an agreement regarding necessary mitigation, agree that no mitigation is needed, or one or both parties determine that negotiation occurred in good faith, but no agreement will be made. The City originally sent letters with a written description of the project and maps depicting the project site to Native American contacts that had previously requested to be contacted by the City for potential consultation on May 22, 2024. When the Mesquite portion of the project site was added, the City sent follow-up letters to the Native American contacts on July 22, 2024. The City received three responses. The Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians submitted a letter dated May 28, 2024, updating their contact information but did not comment on the project nor request consultation. The Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians and Twenty-Nine Palms Band of Mission Indians submitted letters, dated August 20, 2024, and July 12, 2024, respectively, requesting no further consultation. Therefore, the AB 52 consultation process has concluded and is considered completed as of August 20, 2024.
-

### 3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact,” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources      | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy                             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils             | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions           | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality   | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire                           | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

### 3.3 DETERMINATION (TO BE COMPLETED BY THE LEAD AGENCY)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Gabriel Perez

Digitally signed by Gabriel Perez  
DN: c=US, e=gperrez@coachella.org, o=City of Coachella,  
ou=Planning Division - Development Services Dept.,  
CN=Gabriel Perez  
Date: 2024.10.07 12:54:08 -0700

Signature

10/7/24

Date

Gabriel Perez Development Services Director

Print Name and Title

City of Coachella

Lead Agency

### 3.4 EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a Lead Agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off site as well as on site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the Lead Agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Negative Declaration: Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Significant Impact.” The Lead Agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c) (3) (d). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6. Lead Agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans and zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and Lead Agencies are free to use different formats; however, Lead Agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The analysis of each issue should identify: (a) the significance criteria or threshold used to evaluate each question; and (b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

### **3.5 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS**

This section is intended to provide evidence to substantiate the conclusions set forth in the Environmental Checklist. The section will discuss whether or not the proposed project would result in significant environmental impacts.

### 3.5.1 Aesthetics

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.5.1.1 Impact Analysis

##### a. *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*

**No Impact.** A scenic vista is the view of an area that is visually or aesthetically pleasing from a certain vantage point. It is usually viewed from some distance away. Aesthetic components of a scenic vista include (1) scenic quality, (2) sensitivity level, and (3) view access. A scenic vista can be impacted in two ways: a development project can have visual impacts by either directly diminishing the scenic quality of the vista or by blocking the view corridors or “vista” of the scenic resource. Important factors in determining whether a proposed project would block scenic vistas include the project’s proposed height, mass, and location relative to surrounding land uses and travel corridors.

The City of Coachella (City) has views of major geographic features in the region including the Santa Rosa Mountains to the southwest, the Mecca Hills to the south, and the Indio Hills to the north. Because of the relatively flat topography of the proposed Coachella Pocket 7/Mesquite Annexation project site, all of these features are at least partially visible from portions of the proposed project site, which consist of residential land uses and agricultural fields. Several golf courses including the Indian Palms Club and Resort and the Plantation Golf Club are located within 1 mile of the project site. However, there are no scenic views of the golf courses from the project site because of the distance from these resources and intervening land uses.

Existing and historic land uses within the project site consist primarily of agricultural, single-family residential, and commercial land uses. The project site also contains the Forest Lawn Coachella Valley Mortuary, several Rancho Community Event Facilities, the Imagine Schools Riverside County, and a campground. The project site mainly consists of developed and disturbed lands. The project site has partial, distant vistas of mountains to the southwest, north, and east. No development or construction plans are planned as part of the proposed project; therefore, the proposed project would not introduce features that would affect a scenic vista. Any future development on the project site would

be subject to the Coachella General Plan Update 2035 (CGPU) policies and requirements of the City's Zoning Code. Therefore, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

*b. Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?*

**No Impact.** No portions of the project site are adjacent to or within view of a State scenic highway, and, therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any impacts to scenic resources within a State scenic highway. The nearest State scenic highway, State Highway 74, is approximately 13 miles west of the project site. The project site consists of developed and disturbed lands, and does not contain any prominent scenic resources, aside from common ornamental trees associated with existing residential developments. No development or construction plans are planned as part of the proposed project; therefore, the proposed project would not introduce features that would affect or damage a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

Any future development on the project site would be subject to CGPU policies and requirements of the City's Zoning Code.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

*c. Would the project, in non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?*

**No Impact.** The project site is in a non-urbanized (suburban) area, and because no development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project, no features would be introduced with implementation of the proposed project that would degrade the existing visual character or quality from public vantage points. Any future development on the project site would be subject to CGPU policies and requirements of the City's Zoning Code. There are no components of the proposed annexation and SOI update that would degrade the existing visual character. Therefore, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

*d. Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?*

**No Impact.** No development or construction plans are planned as part of the proposed project. Any future development on the project site would be subject to lighting requirements in the City's Zoning Code and policies within the CGPU, which would limit light and glare impacts. Additionally, the project site would continue to be designated for non-industrial land uses, which are not associated with the generation of substantial amounts of light or glare. Therefore, the proposed project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area, and no impact would occur.

---

<sup>1</sup> California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). Scenic Highways, California State Scenic Highways. Website: <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways> (accessed September 7, 2024).

### 3.5.2 Agricultural Resources

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) regarding the State’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.5.2.1 Impact Analysis

*a. Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resource Agency, to non-agricultural use?*

**No Impact.** According to the California Department of Conservation’s California Important Farmland Finder Map, the Coachella Pocket 7/Mesquite Annexation project site includes Prime Farmland, Farmland of Local Importance, Urban and Built-Up Land, and Other Land;<sup>2</sup> however, no development or construction plans are planned as part of the proposed project. Future development on the project site would be similar in nature to development planned in the Coachella General Plan Update 2035

<sup>2</sup> California Department of Conservation. 2020. California Important Farmland Finder Map. Website: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/> (accessed June 16, 2024).

(CGPU), and the proposed annexation would not convert lands to non-agricultural use that are not already planned for such conversion by the CGPU. Any future development on the project site would be subject to CGPU policies and requirements of the City's Zoning Code. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in impacts related to Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Local Importance.

*b. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?*

**No Impact.** The project site includes land zoned for agricultural uses and land that is under a Williamson Act contract. Three parcels (Assessor's Parcel Numbers [APNs] 779-350-005, 779-350-006, and 779-350-011) located at the southeast corner of Planning Area Pocket 7 (P7), are under Coachella Valley Agricultural Preserve No. 29.<sup>3</sup> However, no development or construction plans are planned as part of the proposed project, and any future development on the project site would be similar in nature to development that already is planned by the CGPU. Any future development on the project site would be subject to CGPU policies and requirements of the City's Zoning Code, and any future development that would require cancellation of Williamson Act contracts would be required to undergo the nonrenewal process. Because no development plans or changes in land use are proposed, the proposed project would not directly conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses or conflict with a Williamson Act contract, and no impact would occur.

*c. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 51104(g))?*

**No Impact.** The project site is not zoned for and does not include forest land or timberland. Therefore, no impact on forest land or timberland would occur.

*d. Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?*

**No Impact.** The project site does not include forest land. Therefore, no impact on forest land would occur.

*e. Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use?*

**No Impact.** No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project. The proposed project would not directly result in the conversion of any farmland to non-agricultural uses. Any future development on the project site would be subject to CGPU policies and requirements of the City's Zoning Code. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, the proposed project would not involve other changes in the existing environment that could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use, and no impact would occur.

<sup>3</sup> County of Riverside. n.d. ArcGIS Map Viewer. Website: <https://countyofriverside.maps.arcgis.com/apps/mapviewer/index.html> (accessed October 3, 2024).

### 3.5.3 Air Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.5.3.1 Impact Analysis

##### a. *Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?*

**No Impact.** The project site is located within the City of Coachella, which is part of the South Coast Air Basin, which includes all of Orange County and portions of Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties. Air quality within the South Coast Air Basin is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). SCAQMD and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) adopted the 2022 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP)<sup>4</sup> in December 2022.

Consistency with the 2022 AQMP for the Basin would be achieved if a project is consistent with the goals, objectives, and assumptions in the respective plan to achieve the federal and State air quality standards. Per the SCAQMD *CEQA Air Quality Handbook* (April 1993), there are two main indicators of a project’s consistency with the applicable AQMP: (1) whether the project would increase the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations, or delay timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emission reductions specified in the 2022 AQMP; and (2) whether the project would exceed the 2022 AQMP’s assumptions for 2037 or yearly increments based on the year of project buildout and phasing.

The proposed project would not result in short-term construction and long-term operational pollutant emissions that exceed any emissions thresholds established by SCAQMD because the proposed project does not include development or construction plans. Therefore, the project would not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of an air quality standards violation or cause a new air quality standards violation and the proposed project would be consistent with the first criterion.

The SCAQMD *CEQA Air Quality Handbook* indicates that consistency with AQMP growth assumptions must be analyzed for new or amended General Plan elements, Specific Plans, and significant projects.

<sup>4</sup> South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). 2022. 2022 Air Quality Management Plan. Website: <http://www.aqmd.gov/home/air-quality/clean-air-plans/air-quality-mgt-plan> (accessed June 16, 2024).

Significant projects include airports, electrical generating facilities, petroleum and gas refineries, designation of oil drilling districts, water ports, solid waste disposal sites, and offshore drilling facilities; therefore, the proposed project is not defined as significant. In addition, the City has determined that the project does not require a General Plan or Specific Plan Amendment. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with the second criterion.

No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project. Any future development within the project site would be subject to compliance with all applicable requirements of the AQMP and CGPU policies. Based on the consistency analysis presented above, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the regional AQMP, and no impact would occur.

*b. Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project is a part of the South Coast Air Basin, which is currently designated as non-attainment by federal standards for ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) and non-attainment by State standards for O<sub>3</sub>, particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM<sub>10</sub>), and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. Continued use of the proposed project parcels is anticipated, and no development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project that would result in increased air quality emissions above existing conditions. Any future development on the project site would be subject to all applicable requirements of CGPU policies and the SCAQMD. Because the proposed project would not include development or construction, the proposed project would not violate any air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, and no impact would occur.

*c. Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?*

**No Impact.** Continued use of the proposed project parcels is anticipated, and no construction or development is planned as part of the proposed project. No future development would be allowed with approval of the proposed project that is not already planned by the CGPU or allowed based on the City's Zoning Code. Additionally, a portion of the project area is designated Estate Rancho, which accommodates low-intensity residential development. Any future development within the project site, which would have the potential to emit odors due to construction equipment and activities, would be subject to SCAQMD requirements such as Rule 402 (Nuisance), which requires that a person shall not discharge air contaminants or other materials that would cause health or safety hazards to any considerable number of persons or the public. Residential uses allowed are not associated with the generation of substantial pollutant concentrations or a large amount of truck traffic. Any future development on the project site would be subject to all applicable requirements of CGPU policies and the SCAQMD. The proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and no impact would occur.

*d. Would the project result in other emissions such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people?*

**No Impact.** No construction or development is planned as part of the proposed project, and no future development would be allowed with approval of the proposed project that is not already planned by the CGPU or allowed based on the City's Zoning Code. Future development within the project site

would have the potential to emit odors due to construction equipment and activities. Any future development within the project site would be subject to SCAQMD requirements such as Rule 402 (Nuisance), which requires that a person shall not discharge air contaminants or other materials that would cause health or safety hazards to any considerable number of persons or the public. Because the proposed project does not include changes in land use or construction activities, the proposed project would not result in any emissions or odors, and no impact would occur.

### 3.5.4 Biological Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.5.4.1 Impact Analysis

*a. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or indirectly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

**No Impact.** The City of Coachella (City) has habitat that supports sensitive species including sandy dunes, areas where vegetation is sparse and ground is sandy, grasslands, and agriculture lands. Although the project site includes agricultural lands, including Williamson Act farmlands as discussed in Section 3.5.2 above, which may support sensitive or special-status plant or animal species, no development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not directly result in any impacts to sensitive or special-status plant or animal species. Any future development on the project site would be subject to Coachella General Plan Update 2035 (CGPU) policies and all applicable federal, State, and local regulations protecting sensitive or special-status animal or plant species. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, the proposed project would not result in impacts to sensitive or special-status plant or animal species.

- b. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

**No Impact.** Riparian habitat occurs in very limited amounts north of the City along the Whitewater River. There are no other sensitive habitats within the City's Planning Area. Under existing conditions, the project site comprises a mixture of residentially developed and commercially developed parcels, parcels subject to agricultural uses, vacant/disturbed parcels, the Forest Lawn Coachella Valley, and the Imagine Schools Riverside County. Based on a review of aerial imagery, no suitable riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community is present on the project site. No development or construction would occur as part of the proposed project. Any future development on the project site would be subject to CGPU policies and all applicable federal, State, and local regulations protecting riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities. Therefore, the proposed project would not directly result in any impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities, and no impact would occur.

- c. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?*

**No Impact.** According to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service's (USFWS) Wetlands Mapper,<sup>5</sup> the project site does not contain any federally protected wetlands. The project site is located entirely outside of streambeds, banks, and riparian habitat. Although development may occur within the project site in the future, development would be similar in nature to what is planned by the CGPU and allowed by the City's Zoning Code. Any future development on the project site would be subject to CGPU policies and applicable permits from the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and/or the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, the proposed project would not directly result in any impacts to State or federally protected wetlands.

- d. Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native or resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impeded the use of native wildlife nursery sites?*

**No Impact.** The City's Planning Area contains undeveloped agricultural and open space that is available for use by migratory species. The project site includes agricultural lands, including Williamson Act farmlands as discussed in Section 3.5.2 above, which support migratory wildlife corridors. However, no development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project. Also, the existing condition of the project site includes roadways and fencing surrounding and within the project site that would potentially obstruct wildlife movement. Therefore, the proposed project would not directly interfere with existing wildlife movement or nursery sites. Any future development on the project site would be subject to CGPU policies aimed at preserving sensitive wildlife corridors, agriculture, and open space to ensure minimal impact on sensitive species, including the habitat of migratory species. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or

---

<sup>5</sup> United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). n.d. Wetlands Mapper. Website: <https://www.fws.gov/program/national-wetlands-inventory/wetlands-mapper> (accessed June 16, 2024).

construction, no impact to migratory wildlife corridors or native wildlife nursery sites would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

*e. Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?*

**No Impact.** The Coachella Municipal Code (CMC) does not include ordinances requiring tree preservation and/or protection. No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not directly conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Any future development on the project site would be subject to CGPU policies aimed at protecting biological resources. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

*f. Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The City and its SOI are located within the area for the Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (CVMSHCP). The CVMSHCP identifies sensitive and endangered species and habitats in the Coachella Valley and works to preserve and protect natural habitats. The CVMSHCP identifies land that contains sensitive habitats in specific planning areas and sets to allocate these lands as undevelopable to prevent harm to sensitive or endangered species. Based on the CVMSHCP list of sensitive species, there are few sensitive or threatened species expected to occur within the City and its SOI. As shown in Figure 4.3-3: Active and Proposed MSHCP Conservation Areas near the General Plan Planning Area, of the 2015 CGPU Environmental Impact Report (2015 Program EIR),<sup>6</sup> the project site is not within a CVMSHCP Conservation Area.

No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not directly conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Any future development on the project site would be subject to CGPU policies and CVMSHCP reviews, aimed at protecting biological resources. Therefore, potential impacts from implementation of the proposed project would be less than significant.

---

<sup>6</sup> City of Coachella. 2014b. *General Plan Update Final EIR*, Figure 4.3-3: Active and Proposed MSHCP Conservation Areas near the General Plan Planning Area. October.

3.5.5 Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

3.5.5.1 Impact Analysis

*a. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?*

**No Impact.** Archaeological resources are located throughout the City of Coachella (City). Due to the abundance of cultural resources, the City has an existing ordinance (Section 15.48.190) to prevent destruction of or impact to historical resources. Historic resources within the City are protected through federal and State regulations that prevent the removal or destruction of any historic resources within the Planning Area. No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project. Any future development on the project site would be subject to existing regulations that prevent the removal or destruction of historic resources including the Title 17 of the Coachella Municipal Code (CMC), federal and State regulations, and policies included in the Coachella General Plan Update 2035 (CGPU). Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact to historical resources would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

*b. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?*

**No Impact.** The Mecca Hills, Thermal Canyon, and washes north of Thermal Canyon have sites of archaeologically significant trails, mining sites, and other artifacts from previous settlements. Possible sites are also located along land west of the Whitewater River, and within the Downtown core of the City. The project site consists of suburban, agricultural, and suburban retain land uses. Given the current and historic land uses and soil turnover from agricultural land uses, the potential for archaeological resources to occur in the project site soils would be low. No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project. Any future development on the project site would be subject to existing regulations that prevent the removal or destruction of archaeological resources including federal and State regulations and policies included in the CGPU. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact to archaeological resources would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

*c. Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?*

**No Impact.** No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project, and therefore, there is no potential for disturbance of human remains. Any future development on the project site would be subject to the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 United States Code [USC] 3001) and Sections 7050.5 and 7052 of the California Health and Safety Code. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact to human remains would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

### 3.5.6 Energy

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.5.6.1 Impact Analysis

*a. Would the project result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction?*

**No Impact.** Continued use of the proposed project parcels is anticipated, and no development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project. Therefore, there is no potential for the wasteful or inefficient consumption of energy resources. Any future development on the project site would be subject to existing policies in the Coachella General Plan Update 2035 (CGPU), the California Building Code, and the City of Coachella’s (City) Climate Action Plan (CAP) aimed at encouraging energy efficiency. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact related to inefficient use of energy would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

*b. Would the project conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy resources or energy efficiency?*

**No Impact.** Continued use of the proposed project parcels is anticipated, and no development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project. Therefore, there is no potential for conflict with a plan for renewable energy resources or energy efficiency. Any future development on the project site would be subject to existing policies in the CGPU, the California Building Code, and the City’s CAP aimed at encouraging energy efficiency. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact related to conflict with renewable energy plans would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

### 3.5.7 Geology and Soils

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.5.7.1 Impact Analysis

a. *Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:*

i. *Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidences of known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geological Special Publication 42.)*

**No Impact.** According to Figure 4.5-3: Faults and Fault Zones, of the 2015 Coachella General Plan Update 2035 Environmental Impact Report (2015 Program EIR),<sup>7</sup> the project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. However, according to the California Geological Survey’s California Earthquake Hazards Zone Application, the project site is located approximately 3.8 miles southwest of the San Andreas Fault.<sup>8</sup> Although future development within the project site would be

<sup>7</sup> City of Coachella. 2014c. *General Plan Update Final EIR*, Figure 4.5-3: Faults and Fault Zones. October.

<sup>8</sup> California Geological Survey. 2021. California Earthquake Hazards Zone Application. Website: <https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/geohazards/eq-zapp> (accessed June 17, 2024).

subject to potential rupture of known earthquake faults, no development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project. Therefore, there is no potential for the proposed project to indirectly or directly cause adverse effects related to rupture of a known fault. Any future development on the project site would be subject to existing policies in the Coachella General Plan Update 2035 (CGPU) and the California Building Code that would address safety concerns pertaining to rupture of a known fault. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact related to potential rupture of known earthquake faults would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

*ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project is located within an area that is at high risk for ground shaking during a seismic event. However, no development or construction is proposed with the proposed project. Any future development on the project site would be subject to existing construction regulations and guidelines, including the California Building Code, and policies within the CGPU that would address safety concerns pertaining to seismic ground shaking. Therefore, no impact related to strong seismic ground shaking would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

*iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?*

**No Impact.** As shown on Figure 4.5-5: Liquefaction Risk, of the 2015 Program EIR,<sup>9</sup> the project site is located within a high liquefaction susceptibility zone. However, no development or construction is proposed with the proposed project. Any future development on the project site would be subject to existing construction regulations and guidelines, including the California Building Code and the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act, and policies within the CGPU that would address safety concerns pertaining to liquefaction, including preparation of site-specific geologic or soils investigations and implementation of project-specific measures, as necessary. Therefore, no impact related to liquefaction would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

*iv. Landslides?*

**No Impact.** As shown on Figure 4.5-6: Landslide Risk, of the 2015 Program EIR,<sup>10</sup> the project site is not located within a high landslide risk zone. Due to the flat topography of the project site, landslide risk within or adjacent to the project site is low. No development or construction is proposed with the proposed project. Any future development on the project site would be subject to existing construction regulations and guidelines, including the California Building Code and the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act, and policies within the CGPU that would address safety concerns pertaining to landslides. Therefore, no impact related to landslides would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

*b. Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?*

**No Impact.** Portions of the project site are located within a high-to-very-high erosion potential area, as shown in Figure 4.5-8: Erosion Potential, of the 2015 Program EIR.<sup>11</sup> However, no development or

<sup>9</sup> City of Coachella. 2014d. *General Plan Update Final EIR*, Figure 4.5-5: Liquefaction Risk. October.

<sup>10</sup> City of Coachella. 2014e. *General Plan Update Final EIR*, Figure 4.5-6: Landslide Risk. October.

<sup>11</sup> City of Coachella. 2014f. *General Plan Update Final EIR*, Figure 4.5-8: Erosion Potential. October.

construction is planned as part of the proposed project. Any future development on the project site would be subject to existing regulatory requirements for both temporary and permanent erosion control including the preparation, approval, and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, best management practices, and CGPU policies that would address potential erosion impacts. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact related to erosion would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

*c. Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-site or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?*

**No Impact.** Land subsidence is the gradual, local settling or shrinking of the earth's surface with little or no horizontal motion. During very large earthquakes, it is possible for subsidence or seismically induced settlement to occur in loose granular soils in flat or gently sloped portions of areas as the result of intense ground shaking.

The City's Planning Area, including the project site, is considered to have active subsidence. However, no development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project. Any future development on the project site would be required to undergo geotechnical and engineering geological investigations that address site-specific geologic hazards at the project site as stipulated by the CGPU. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact related to unstable soils would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

*d. Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating direct or indirect substantial risks to life or property?*

**No Impact.** The City's Planning Area is subject to potential expansive soil hazards in the vicinity of the Thermal Airport and along the Southern Pacific Railroad tracks, approximately 3 miles southeast and 1.25 miles northeast of the project site, respectively. Soils derived from weathering of consolidated sedimentary rocks in the Mecca Hills in and around the San Andreas Fault Zone are also considered to have a moderate expansion potential. The project site is not located in the vicinity of these areas and there is a low risk for the presence of expansion soils. No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project. Any future development on the project site would be required to prepare a site-specific geotechnical investigation, implement site-specific recommendations, and be subject to the California Building Code, which contains minimum requirements for construction on expansive soil. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact related to expansive soils would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

*e. Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?*

**No Impact.** No portion of the project site is within an existing sewer service area, and no development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project. Any future development on the project site requiring new septic systems would be required to follow the standards of the Riverside County Environmental Health Department, and the City's Engineering Department would review and approve

proposals for consistency with regulatory requirements. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact to septic or alternative wastewater disposal systems would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

*f. Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?*

**No Impact.** The project site is located within the western portion of the City's Planning Area. The western and southern portions of the Planning Area have a low sensitivity, or probability, for having paleontological resources. No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project. Any future development on the project site would be subject to existing regulations that prevent the removal or destruction of paleontological resources including federal and State regulations and policies included in the CGPU. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact to paleontological resources would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

### 3.5.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.5.8.1 Impact Analysis

*a. Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?*

**No Impact.** Potential sources of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions include internal combustion vehicle use, gas-powered construction equipment, heating and cooling systems, and gas-powered landscaping equipment, among others. These sources of GHG emissions are present under existing conditions on the project site. Continued use of the proposed project parcels is anticipated, and no development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project. Therefore, there is no potential for direct or indirect generation of GHG emissions. Any future development on the project site would be subject to existing policies in the Coachella General Plan Update 2035 (CGPU) aimed at limiting vehicle use and energy consumption to reduce GHG emissions. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact related to generation of GHG emissions would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

*b. Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?*

**No Impact.** No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project, and therefore, there is no potential to conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation related to GHG emissions. Any future development on the project site would be subject to existing policies in the CGPU aimed at reducing GHG emissions. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact related to conflicts with plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

3.5.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

3.5.9.1 Impact Analysis

a. *Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?*

**No Impact.** Potential sources of hazardous materials include, but are not limited to, fuel spills and agricultural chemical use such as pesticides. Continued use of the proposed project parcels is anticipated, and no development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project. Therefore, there is no potential for transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Any future development on the project site that would require transportation of hazardous materials would be subject to existing regulations and the City of Coachella’s (City) Coachella General Plan Update 2035 (CGPU) policies requiring safe transport, ongoing vehicle inspections, State licensing of transporters, and effective response to spills. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

- b. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?*

**No Impact.** The land uses associated with the existing project site (agricultural, residential, and commercial) do not require the extensive use of hazardous materials. Although pesticides may be used in limited quantities on the agricultural land uses within the project site, the limited size and capacity of these uses within the project site limit the risk of accidental release of hazardous materials within or adjacent to the project site. Within the project site, the most likely occurrence of hazardous materials release would occur at a small scale associated with domestic or commercial uses or potential use of pesticides. No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project, and therefore, there is no potential for release of hazardous materials. Any future development on the project site would be subject to existing State and federal regulations governing the safe use, storage, disposal, and cleanup of hazardous waste. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

- c. Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?*

**No Impact.** The project site includes the Imagine Schools Riverside County. Additionally, Coral Mountain Academy Elementary School is within 0.25 mile of the project site. However, no development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project, and therefore, there is no potential for release of hazardous materials near schools. Any future development on the project site would be subject to existing CGPU policies that include development constraints for land uses that could release emissions near schools. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

- d. Would the project be located on site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?*

**No Impact.** There are no registered sites containing hazardous materials pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 within the project site.<sup>12</sup> No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project. Any future development on the project site would be subject to the Safety Element policies of the CGPU that address strategies to prevent negative environmental impacts of hazardous material sites. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

---

<sup>12</sup> California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2023. *Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List*. Website: [https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search.asp?cmd=search&reporttype=CORTESE&site\\_type=CSITES,OPEN,FUDS,CLOSE&status=ACT,BKLG,COM&reporttitle=HAZARDOUS+WASTE+AND+SUBSTANCES+SITE+LIST](https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search.asp?cmd=search&reporttype=CORTESE&site_type=CSITES,OPEN,FUDS,CLOSE&status=ACT,BKLG,COM&reporttitle=HAZARDOUS+WASTE+AND+SUBSTANCES+SITE+LIST) (accessed June 17, 2024).

- e. *For a project located within an airport land use plan or where such a plan has not been adopted within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?*

**No Impact.** As shown in Figure 4.6-1: General Plan Land Use Map with Airport Compatibility Zone, of the 2015 CGPU Environmental Impact Report (2015 Program EIR),<sup>13</sup> no portion of the proposed project is located within the Airport Compatibility Zones of the Thermal Airport. The project site is not within 2 miles of an airport. Therefore, no impact related to airport land uses would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

- f. *Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

**No Impact.** The City's Emergency Operations Plan identifies high risk areas within the City and its vicinity for various emergencies (e.g., floods, fires, and earthquake damage) and identifies plans to address large-scale emergencies within the City (e.g., evacuations).<sup>14</sup> The project site and vicinity are included in the City's emergency operations plan. Continued use of the proposed project parcels is anticipated, and no development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project. Therefore, there is no potential for impairment of an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. Any future development on the project site would be required to comply with existing emergency response plans and would be subject to policies in the CGPU aimed at preventing the interference with any plans and addressing hazards. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

- g. *Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?*

**No Impact.** The project site is not located within a State Responsibility Area and has not been designated as a High or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone.<sup>15</sup> No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project, and therefore, the proposed project would not result in risk of wildland fires. Any future development on the project site would be subject to existing CGPU policies that aim to protect structures, open space, and population from wildland fires. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

<sup>13</sup> City of Coachella. 2014i. *General Plan Update Final EIR*, Figure 4.6-1: General Plan Land Use Map with Airport Compatibility Zone. October.

<sup>14</sup> City of Coachella. 2021. Emergency Operations Plan. October. Website: <https://mccmeetingspublic.blob.core.usgovcloudapi.net/coachelaca-meet-9f8743b89337475fb6aa79c328ed82c4/ITEM-Attachment-001-161f355d346b474ca9e536bdf5ca124e.pdf> (accessed September 6, 2024).

<sup>15</sup> California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). 2022. *Riverside County State Responsibility Area Fire Hazard Severity Zones*. November 21. Website: <https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/what-we-do/community-wildfire-preparedness-and-mitigation/fire-hazard-severity-zones/fire-hazard-severity-zones-maps> (accessed June 24, 2024).

### 3.5.10 Hydrology and Water Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.5.10.1 Impact Analysis

*a. Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?*

**No Impact.** The project area falls under the jurisdiction of the Regional Water Quality Control Board’s (RWQCB) Colorado River Basin Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan).<sup>16</sup> The project site currently conforms to the Basin Plan’s water quality standards. Because the proposed project does not include any development or construction, no change to the project site’s conformity to these standards would occur. The groundwater supply for the Planning Area comes from the Whitewater River Basin. The Lower Whitewater River Basin water is pulled by the Coachella Valley Water District (CVWD) and allocated to various jurisdictions including the City of Coachella (City). The Lower Whitewater River Basin currently meets demands of the project site, and expected water demands associated with the project site represent a small proportion of the overall groundwater capacity.<sup>17</sup> No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project, and therefore, the proposed project would

<sup>16</sup> California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Water Quality Control Plan for the Colorado River Basin Region. 2019. Website: [https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/coloradoriver/water\\_issues/programs/basin\\_planning/docs/2020/rb7bp\\_e2019.pdf](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/coloradoriver/water_issues/programs/basin_planning/docs/2020/rb7bp_e2019.pdf) (accessed September 8, 2024).

<sup>17</sup> City of Coachella. 2014a. *General Plan Update Final EIR*. October.

not have the potential to violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Any future development on the project site would be subject to existing federal, State, and local water quality regulations and policies within the CGPU that are structured to preserve and protect water quality, including the Basin Plan. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

*b. Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede substantial groundwater management of the basin?*

**No Impact.** As noted above, the groundwater supply for the Planning Area comes from the Whitewater River Basin. The Lower Whitewater River Basin water is extracted by the CVWD and allocated to various jurisdictions including the City of Coachella. The Lower Whitewater River Basin currently meets demands of the project site, and expected water demands associated with the project site represent a small proportion of the overall groundwater capacity. No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project, and therefore, the proposed project would not have the potential to decrease groundwater supplies or groundwater recharge. Any future development on the project site would be subject to water supply and conservation policies included in the Coachella General Plan Update 2035 (CGPU) and Coachella Valley Urban Water Management Plan (CVUWMP) and would be required to demonstrate that sufficient water supply would be available to serve future projects. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

*c. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:*

*i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site?*

**No Impact.** No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project, and therefore, the proposed project would not have the potential to result in erosion or siltation. Any future development on the project site would be subject to existing federal, State, and local regulatory requirements including the Clean Water Act, the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Program, Streambed Alteration Agreements, and policies that address erosion impacts included in the CGPU. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

*ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site?*

**No Impact.** The project site lies outside the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) 100-year floodplain. No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project, and therefore, the proposed project would not have the potential to substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding. Any future development on the project site would be required to assess site drainage patterns prior to construction as to not disrupt existing drainage patterns and would be subject to existing policies included in the CGPU that address potential impacts from drainage changes. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

*iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?*

**No Impact.** The project site is located more than 2 miles from the Whitewater Storm Channel, located on the north and east sides of the City of Coachella. Stormwater from the project site is channeled through the stormwater system along adjacent roadways, through the City of Coachella and eventually into the stormwater channel. No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project, and therefore, the proposed project would not have the potential to create or contribute runoff water. Any future development on the project site would be subject to existing federal, State, and local regulations that address impacts of polluted runoff and stress on the existing drainage system including the Clean Water Act, the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, RWQCB Plans, the NPDES Program, and policies included in the CGPU. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

*iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?*

**No Impact.** The project site is not located within a FEMA designated 100-year floodplain. According to the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) No. 06065C2262H, the project site is located within Zone X.<sup>18</sup> Zone X is designated as an area determined to be outside the 500-year floodplain. No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project, and therefore, the proposed project would not have the potential to impede or redirect flood flows. Any future development on the project site would be subject to existing federal, State, and local regulations that address impacts of polluted runoff and stress on the existing drainage system including the Clean Water Act, the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, RWQCB Plans, the NPDES Program, and policies within the CGPU. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

*d. Would the project result in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?*

**No Impact.** As shown in Figure 4.7-2: Flood Hazards, of the 2015 CGPU Environmental Impact Report (2015 Program EIR),<sup>19</sup> the project site contains moderate and low risk flood zones. No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project, and therefore, the proposed project would not have the potential to result in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones. Any future development on the project site would be subject to policies within the CGPU. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

*e. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?*

**No Impact.** The City's wastewater treatment facilities are managed by the Coachella Sanitary District and are under the purview of the Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board

<sup>18</sup> Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 2018. National Flood Hazard Layer FIRMette. Website: <https://msc.fema.gov/portal/home> (accessed June 24, 2024).

<sup>19</sup> City of Coachella. 2014h. *General Plan Update Final EIR*, Figure 4.7-2: Flood Hazards. October.

(CRBRWQCB). This includes the project site, despite the project site not having connection to sewer services. In order for wastewater treatment facilities to be in operation, they must comply with all requirements of the CRBRWQCB with annual reporting to monitor treatment practices. Wastewater treatment demands resulting from implementation of the CGPU must comply with requirements set forth in the CRBRWQCB. No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project, and therefore, the proposed project would not have the potential to impact groundwater. Any future development on the project site would be subject to water supply and conservation policies included in the CGPU and the RWQCB's Colorado River Basin Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan). Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

### 3.5.11 Land Use and Planning

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.5.11.1 Impact Analysis

##### *a. Would the project physically divide an established community?*

**No Impact.** The project site, under current conditions, is dominated by suburban and agricultural land uses. The project site is surrounded by existing roadways including Jackson Street, Avenue 50, Avenue 51, Calhoun Street, and Avenue 52. Through implementation of the proposed project, no new transportation corridors or road closures are proposed. No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project, and therefore, the proposed project would not have the potential to physically divide an established community. Land uses designated for the project site in the Coachella General Plan Update 2035 (CGPU) and the City of Coachella’s (City) Zoning Code would remain. Any future development would be subject to policies in the CGPU and the City’s Zoning Code. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no community division impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

##### *b. Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?*

**No Impact.** The General Plan identifies Land Use Policy 1.2 - Annexation. This policy allows the annexation of new land into the City when at least 60 percent of the land within the City limits is built with urban uses or permanently preserved open space.

The proposed project involves the annexation of parcels currently under the jurisdiction of the County of Riverside General Plan. The lands involved in the proposed project would continue to be used for agricultural, suburban residential, and suburban retail purposes, and implementation of the proposed project would not change current land uses. If utilities (e.g., sewer lines) were extended to serve the project site in the future, that action would be subject to project-level environmental analysis required under CEQA. Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation in terms of environmental effects. There would be no impact.

### 3.5.12 Mineral Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.5.12.1 Impact Analysis

a. *Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?*

**No Impact.** No portion of the proposed project site is used for mining operations or is located within an area classified as Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) 2 (MRZ-2), as shown in Figure 4.5-9: Mineral Resources, of the 2015 Coachella General Plan Update 2035 Environmental Impact Report (2015 Program EIR)<sup>20</sup> and Figure 4.12.1: Mineral Resource Areas, of the County of Riverside General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR).<sup>21</sup> No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project, and therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of a known mineral resource. Any future development on the project site would be subject to State regulations and policies within the Coachella General Plan Update 2035 (CGPU) that protect mineral resources and serve to prevent the loss of availability of a known mineral resource. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

b. *Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?*

**No Impact.** As discussed in Section 3.5.12(a) above, the proposed project would have no impact on mineral resources. Any future development on the project site would be subject to State regulations and policies within the CGPU that protect mineral resources. Therefore, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

<sup>20</sup> City of Coachella. 2014h. *General Plan Update Final EIR*, Figure 4.5-9: Mineral Resources. October.

<sup>21</sup> County of Riverside. 2003. *Riverside County General Plan Final Program EIR*, Figure 4.12.1: Mineral Resource Areas.

### 3.5.13 Noise

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in:				
a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.5.13.1 Impact Analysis

*a. Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?*

**No Impact.** The project site is bordered on all sides by roadways including Jackson Street to the west, Avenue 52 to the south, Avenues 50 and 51 at the north end of the project site, and Van Buren Street as the closest major street to the east, though the project site is not bounded by it. These roadways are major sources of noise in the project site vicinity. Agricultural land uses within and adjacent to the project site also produce occasional noise from equipment on site. No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project, and therefore, the proposed project would not have the potential to result in increased noise levels. Any future development on the project site would be subject to existing Coachella General Plan Update 2035 (CGPU) goals and policies that would ensure development would not expose noise-sensitive receptors to noise levels in excess of the City of Coachella’s (City) standards. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

*b. Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?*

**No Impact.** Groundborne vibration can occur from a variety of sources, including heavy equipment movement and ground disturbing activities such as earthmoving and pile driving. No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project, and therefore, the proposed project would not have the potential to result in vibration. Any future development on the project site would be subject to existing Coachella Municipal Code (CMC) requirements related to noise and vibration in addition to existing CGPU policies. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

- c. *For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?*

**No Impact.** As discussed in Sections 3.5.13(a) and 3.5.13(b), the proposed project does not include development or construction, and therefore, would not result in noise or vibration. Additionally, the project site is not within 2 miles of an airport. Therefore, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

### 3.5.14 Population and Housing

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.5.14.1 Impact Analysis

*a. Would the project induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?*

**No Impact.** No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project, and therefore, the proposed project would not result in population growth. Any future development on the project site would be subject to existing Coachella General Plan Update 2035 (CGPU) policies, California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review at the project level, and the City of Coachella’s (City) Zoning Code. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

*b. Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

**No Impact.** No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project, and therefore, the proposed project would not result in displacement of people or housing. Any future development on the project site would be subject to existing CGPU policies, CEQA review at the project level, and the City’s Zoning Code. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

3.5.15 Public Services

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
i. Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
v. Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

3.5.15.1 Impact Analysis

a. *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:*

- i. Fire Protection?*
- ii. Police Protection?*
- iii. Schools?*
- iv. Parks?*
- v. Other Public Facilities?*

**No Impact.** The Riverside County Fire Department serves the unincorporated areas of Riverside County and the City of Coachella (City). The fire station closest to the project site is Station 79, located at 1377 Sixth Street, which provides fire suppression and emergency medical services.<sup>22</sup> The Riverside County Sheriff’s Department is contracted to provide law enforcement services through the City Police Department and the police station within the City is located at 86625 Airport Boulevard.<sup>23</sup> Additionally, the project site is within the Coachella Valley Unified School District boundary. Coral Mountain Academy, within the Coachella Valley Unified School District, is located adjacent to the project site and the Imagine Schools Riverside County, within the Riverside County Office of Education

<sup>22</sup> City of Coachella. n.d-b. Fire Department. Website: <https://www.coachella.org/departments/fire-department> (accessed June 24, 2024).

<sup>23</sup> City of Coachella. n.d-c. Police Department. Website: <https://www.coachella.org/departments/police-department> (accessed June 24, 2024).

District, is located within the project site. Bagdouma Park is the closest park to the project site, approximately 1 mile east.<sup>24</sup>

No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project. The project site is within the City's SOI or within the General Plan Planning Area (P7) and will continue to be served by the existing services. The proposed project would not require additional fire and police protection or necessitate the construction of schools, parks, or other public facilities. Any future development on the project site would be subject to existing policies in the Coachella General Plan Update 2035 (CGPU) aimed at improving public services. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

---

<sup>24</sup> City of Coachella. n.d-a. Bagdouma Park. Website: <https://www.coachella.org/residents/parks-and-recreation> (accessed June 26, 2024).

3.5.16 Recreation

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

3.5.16.1 Impact Analysis

a. *Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not change any existing land uses within the project site. No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project, and the proposed project would not alter the land uses within the project site. The proposed project would not result in any new development, so no increase in population or increased use of existing recreational facilities would occur. There are no parks within the project site. The closest park to the project site is Bagdouma park, located approximately 1 mile east of the project site. No General Plan land use designation or zoning designation changes are proposed. Therefore, the proposed project would not increase the use of the existing campground or parks or other recreational facilities. Any future development of the project site would be subject to policies outlined in the Coachella General Plan Update 2035 (CGPU) aimed at maintaining existing park facilities or contributing to new park facilities, including Mello-Roos, which would require a separate California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) evaluation. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

b. *Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?*

**No Impact.** No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project, and the proposed project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Any future development of the project site would be subject to policies outlined in the CGPU aimed at maintaining existing park facilities or contributing to new park facilities, including Mello-Roos, which would require a separate CEQA evaluation. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

### 3.5.17 Transportation

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict or be inconsistent with <i>CEQA Guidelines</i> Section 15064.3, Subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.5.17.1 Impact Analysis

*a. Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?*

**No Impact.** The City of Coachella’s (City) General Plan Mobility Element identifies the City’s transportation network, including roadways within and adjacent to the project site. No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project, and the proposed project would not conflict with the City’s General Plan Mobility Element. The General Plan Mobility Element goals include complete streets with a balanced mobility system, traffic calming, improving the pedestrian network, a bicycle trail network, transit supportive development network, sustainable transportation, an ongoing monitoring system, and regional connectivity. The proposed project would not conflict with any of these goals. Any future development of the project site would be subject to policies outlined in the Coachella General Plan Update 2035 (CGPU) and would require CEQA evaluation to evaluate potential impacts related to vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

*b. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, Subdivision (b)?*

**No Impact.** Section 15064.3 of the *State CEQA Guidelines* codifies that project-related transportation impacts are typically best measured by evaluating the project’s VMT. However, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, a VMT analysis is not required. Any future development of the project site would be subject to policies outlined in the CGPU. Therefore, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

*c. Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?*

**No Impact.** No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project, and therefore, it would not increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible use. Any future development

of the project site would be subject to policies outlined in the CGPU. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

*d. Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?*

**No Impact.** No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project, and therefore, it would not result in inadequate emergency access. Emergency access to the project site would remain the same as existing conditions. Any future development of the project site would be subject to policies outlined in the CGPU. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

### 3.5.18 Tribal Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)? Or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.5.18.1 Impact Analysis

- a. *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:*
- i. *Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1 (k)*
  - ii. *A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.*

**No Impact.** Consultation was undertaken with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) concerning sacred land listings for the project site. An information request letter was delivered to the NAHC. The NAHC responded indicating that a search of their Sacred Lands File was negative. The consultation list from the NAHC included the following tribes:

- Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians
- Augustine Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians
- Cabazon Band of Mission Indians

- Cahuilla Band of Indians
- Campo Band of Diegueno Mission Indians
- Ewiiapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians
- La Posta Band of Diegueno Mission Indians
- Los Coyotes Band of Cahuilla and Cupeño Indians
- Manzanita Band of Kumeyaay Nation
- Mesa Grande Band of Diegueno Mission Indians
- Morongo Band of Mission Indians
- Quechan Tribe of the Fort Yuma Reservation
- Ramona Band of Cahuilla Indians
- Santa Rosa Band of Cahuilla Indians
- Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians
- Torres-Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians
- Twenty-Nine Palms Band of Mission Indians

Letters were sent to the above listed tribes on May 22, 2024, and again on July 22, 2024, when the Mesquite portion of the project site was added. Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians responded on May 28, 2024, providing updated contact information but did not comment on the project nor request consultation. The City received letters from the Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians and Twenty-Nine Palms Band of Mission Indians on August 20, 2024, and July 12, 2024, respectively, requesting no further consultation. In summary, no requests for tribal consultation were received in response to Native American outreach.

### 3.5.19 Utilities and Service Systems

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Comply with federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.5.19.1 Impact Analysis

*a. Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?*

**No Impact.** No development or construction is proposed with the project, and therefore, the proposed project would not require relocation or construction of utility facilities. Any future development on the project site would be subject to plan checks and project-specific California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) reviews that would evaluate the individual project's infrastructure needs and impacts. Therefore, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

*b. Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?*

**No Impact.** As discussed in Section 3.5.10 above, the groundwater supply for the project site comes from the Whitewater River Basin. The Lower Whitewater River Basin water is extracted by the Coachella Valley Water District (CVWD) and allocated to various jurisdictions including the City of Coachella (City). The Lower Whitewater River Basin currently meets demands of the project site, and expected water demands associated with the project site represent a small proportion of the overall groundwater capacity. No development or construction is proposed with the proposed project, and therefore, the proposed project would not require water supplies. Any growth that would occur from the implementation of the proposed project would be consistent with previous projections as the project does not propose any changes to land use or density. Additionally, future development would be subject to existing policies in the CGPU and CVWD's Coachella Valley Water Management Plan

aimed at maintaining sufficient water supply. Therefore, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

*c. Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?*

**No Impact.** As discussed above in Section 3.5.10, the City's wastewater treatment facilities are managed by the Coachella Sanitary District and are under the Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board (CRBRWQCB). In order for wastewater treatment facilities to be in operation, they must comply with all requirements of the CRBRWQCB with annual reporting to monitor treatment practices. Wastewater treatment demands resulting from implementation of the Coachella General Plan Update 2035 (CGPU) must comply with requirements set forth in the CRBRWQCB. No development or construction is proposed with the proposed project, and therefore, the proposed project would not require changes to wastewater treatment facilities. Any growth that would occur from the implementation of the proposed project would be consistent with previous projections as the project does not propose any changes to land use or density. Additionally, future development would be subject to existing policies in the CGPU aimed at maintaining service from existing and planned wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

*d. Would the project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?*

**No Impact.** Prior analysis under the 2015 CGPU Environmental Impact Report (2015 Program EIR) determined that development consistent with the CGPU would increase the Planning Area's population from approximately 40,000 currently, to 135,000 by 2035. This would include the project site. Solid waste generated under the CGPU could reach 131,800 tons per year by 2035, equating to roughly 360 tons per day. The Coachella Valley Transfer Station, which receives and transfers waste from the City of Coachella and the City of Indio, currently receives an average of 328 tons of waste per day and has a capacity of 1,100 tons of waste per day. Based on these metrics, there is capacity for any additional waste generated by the project site, though no additional waste is anticipated with implementation of the proposed project. No development or construction is proposed with the proposed project, and therefore, the proposed project would not directly result in significant changes to landfill services or capacity in the City. Any future development would be subject to existing policies in the CGPU aimed at maintaining landfill services. Therefore, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

*e. Would the project comply with federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?*

**No Impact.** Policies identified in the Infrastructure and Public Services Element of the CGPU (Policies 5.1 through 5.16) outline measures to reduce impacts to landfill services and capacity in the City. No development or construction is proposed with the proposed project, and therefore, the proposed project would not directly result in any activities or development that would conflict with federal, State, or local statutes related to solid waste generation in the City. Any future development would be subject to existing policies in the CGPU and all federal, State, and local statutes. Therefore, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

### 3.5.20 Wildfire

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.5.20.1 Impact Analysis

*a. Would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

**No Impact.** The project site is not located within a State Responsibility Area and has not been designated as a High or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone.<sup>25</sup> As discussed above in Section 3.5.9, the City of Coachella’s (City) Emergency Operations Plan identifies high risk areas within the City and its vicinity for various emergencies, including wildfires, and identifies plans to address large-scale emergencies within the City, including evacuations.<sup>26</sup> The project site and vicinity are included in the City’s emergency operations plan. No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project, and therefore, there is no potential for impairment of an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. Any future development on the project site would be required to comply with existing emergency response plans and would be subject to policies in the Coachella General Plan Update 2035 (CGPU) aimed at preventing the interference with any plans and addressing hazards. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

<sup>25</sup> California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). 2022. *Riverside County State Responsibility Area Fire Hazard Severity Zones*. November 21. Website: [https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/media/uk1pwwva/fhsz\\_county\\_sra\\_11x17\\_2022\\_riverside\\_ada.pdf](https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/media/uk1pwwva/fhsz_county_sra_11x17_2022_riverside_ada.pdf) (accessed June 17, 2024).

<sup>26</sup> City of Coachella. 2021. *Emergency Operations Plan*. October. Website: <https://mccmeetingspublic.blob.core.usgovcloudapi.net/coachelaca-meet-9f8743b89337475fb6aa79c328ed82c4/ITEM-Attachment-001-161f355d346b474ca9e536bdf5ca124e.pdf> (accessed September 6, 2024).

- b. Would the project, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?*

**No Impact.** The project site is not located within a State Responsibility Area and has not been designated as a High or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone.<sup>27</sup> However, the natural landscapes and agriculture lands adjacent to urban development in the Planning Area present urban-wildland interface areas at risk of wildfires. No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project, and therefore, the proposed project would not exacerbate wildfire risks. Any future development on the project site would be subject to existing CGPU policies that aim to protect structures, open space, and population from wildland fires. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

- c. Would the project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?*

**No Impact.** As discussed in Section 3.5.20(b), the project site includes agricultural areas that present an urban-wildland interface and could be at risk of wildfires. However, no development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project, and therefore, the proposed project would not require installation or maintenance of infrastructure related to fire risk. Any future development on the project site would be subject to existing CGPU policies that aim to protect structures, open space, and population from wildland fires. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

- d. Would the project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?*

**No Impact.** The topography of the surrounding areas and entire project site is relatively flat. No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project, and therefore, given the level topography on site, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to significant risks from flooding or landslides, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. Any future development on the project site would be subject to existing CGPU policies that aim to protect structures, open space, and population from wildland fires. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, no impact would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

---

<sup>27</sup> California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). 2022. Riverside County State Responsibility Area Fire Hazard Severity Zones. November 21. Website: [https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/media/uk1pvwva/fhsz\\_county\\_sra\\_11x17\\_2022\\_riverside\\_ada.pdf](https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/media/uk1pvwva/fhsz_county_sra_11x17_2022_riverside_ada.pdf) (accessed June 17, 2024).

### 3.5.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.5.21.1 Impact Analysis

a. *Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?*

**No Impact.** As articulated in Section 3.5.4, Biological Resources, the proposed project would not impact any fish or wildlife species or associated habitat. The proposed project does not include construction or development, and therefore, would have no impact on biological resources. Because the proposed project does not include development or construction, the proposed project would not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Any future development on the project site would be subject to existing state, federal, and local regulations regarding biological and cultural resources. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, the proposed project would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts.

b. *Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)*

**No Impact.** No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project. As discussed in Sections 3.5.1 through 3.5.20, the proposed project would result in no significant project-specific

impacts. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, the proposed project would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts.

*c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?*

**No Impact.** No development or construction is planned as part of the proposed project. As discussed in Sections 3.5.1 through 3.5.20, the proposed project would result in no significant project-specific impacts. Therefore, because the proposed project does not include development or construction, the proposed project would not result in environmental effects that have the potential to cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.

## 4.0 REFERENCES

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). 2022. *Riverside County State Responsibility Area Fire Hazard Severity Zones*. November 21. Website: [https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/media/uk1pwwva/fhsz\\_county\\_sra\\_11x17\\_2022\\_riverside\\_ada.pdf](https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/media/uk1pwwva/fhsz_county_sra_11x17_2022_riverside_ada.pdf) (accessed June 17, 2024).

California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2023. *Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List*. Website: [https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search.asp?cmd=search&reporttype=CORTESE&site\\_type=CSITES,OPEN,FUDS,CLOSE&status=ACT,BKLG,COM&reporttitle=HAZARDOUS+WASTE+AND+SUBSTANCES+SITE+LIST](https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search.asp?cmd=search&reporttype=CORTESE&site_type=CSITES,OPEN,FUDS,CLOSE&status=ACT,BKLG,COM&reporttitle=HAZARDOUS+WASTE+AND+SUBSTANCES+SITE+LIST) (accessed June 17, 2024).

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). Website: <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways> (accessed September 7, 2024).

California Geological Survey. 2021. California Earthquake Hazards Zone Application. Website: <https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/geohazards/eq-zapp> (accessed June 17, 2024).

California Regional Water Quality Control Board. Water Quality Control Plan for the Colorado River Basin Region. 2019. Website: [https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/coloradoriver/water\\_issues/programs/basin\\_planning/docs/2020/rb7bp\\_e2019.pdf](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/coloradoriver/water_issues/programs/basin_planning/docs/2020/rb7bp_e2019.pdf) (accessed September 8, 2024).

City of Coachella. 2014a. *General Plan Update Final EIR*. October.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2014b. *General Plan Update Final EIR*, Figure 4.3-3: Active and Proposed MSHCP Conservation Areas near the General Plan Planning Area. October.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2014c. *General Plan Update Final EIR*, Figure 4.5-3: Faults and Fault Zones. October.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2014d. *General Plan Update Final EIR*, Figure 4.5-5: Liquefaction Risk. October.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2014e. *General Plan Update Final EIR*, Figure 4.5-6: Landslide Risk. October.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2014f. *General Plan Update Final EIR*, Figure 4.5-8: Erosion Potential. October.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2014g. *General Plan Update Final EIR*, Figure 4.5-9: Mineral Resources. October.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2014h. *General Plan Update Final EIR*, Figure 4.7-2: Flood Hazards. October.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2014i. *General Plan Update Final EIR*, Figure 4.6-1: General Plan Land Use Map with Airport Compatibility Zone. October.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2021. Emergency Operations Plan. Website: <https://mccmeetingspublic.blob.core.usgovcloudapi.net/coachelaca-meet-9f8743b89337475fb6aa79c328ed82c4/ITEM-Attachment-001-161f355d346b474ca9e536bdf5ca124e.pdf> (accessed September 6, 2024).

- 
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2023. General Plan EIR Addendum. July 2023. (accessed June 24, 2024).
- \_\_\_\_\_. n.d-a. Bagdouma Park. Website: <https://www.coachella.org/residents/parks-and-recreation> (accessed June 26, 2024).
- \_\_\_\_\_. n.d-b. Fire Department. Website: <https://www.coachella.org/departments/fire-department> (accessed June 24, 2024).
- \_\_\_\_\_. n.d-c. Police Department. Website: <https://www.coachella.org/departments/police-department> (accessed June 24, 2024).
- County of Riverside. 2003. *Riverside County General Plan Final Program EIR*, Figure 4.12.1: Mineral Resource Areas.
- \_\_\_\_\_. n.d. ArcGIS Map Viewer. Website: <https://countyofriverside.maps.arcgis.com/apps/mapviewer/index.html> (accessed October 3, 2024).
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 2018. National Flood Hazard Layer FIRMette. Website: <https://msc.fema.gov/portal/home> (accessed June 24, 2024).
- South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). 2022. 2022 Air Quality Management Plan. Website: <http://www.aqmd.gov/home/air-quality/clean-air-plans/air-quality-mgt-plan> (accessed June 16, 2024).
- United States Fish and Wildlife Service. n.d. Wetlands Mapper. Website: <https://www.fws.gov/program/national-wetlands-inventory/wetlands-mapper> (accessed June 16, 2024).